



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

theory of verbal inspiration with the idea of progressive revelation. In treating the words of the Bible as literal, infallible, and ultimate, the Shakers did only what almost all the other Christians of their time were doing. But what they drew from their study of the Bible — the characteristic tenet of the nearness of Christ's Second Advent — was taken up in the first third of the nineteenth century by the more energetic hands of William Miller; and among the 50,000 who in 1843 stood in their white robes ready to ascend at the Lord's appearing, there were doubtless many who, if they had lived a generation earlier, would have been attracted by Shakerism.

Among the valuable features of Miss Sears's book are the vivid descriptions of the mobs which attacked the Shakers, the music and words of many of the Shaker hymns, together with ample data of the farm-produce and especially of the herb-department. For a fuller view of what the Shakers say of themselves, the book needs to be supplemented by such works as *Testimonies to the Precepts of Mother Ann Lee, Collected from Living Witnesses; Shakerism, its Meaning and Message*, by Anna White and Leila S. Taylor; and especially *Shaker Sermons, Containing the Substance of Shaker Theology*, by Bishop Henry L. Eads.

FREDERIC PALMER.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

LUTHER AND LUTHERDOM. From Original Sources by Heinrich Denifle. Translated from the Second Revised Edition of the German by RAYMUND VOLZ. Vol. I, Part 1. Torch Press. Somerset, Ohio. 1917. Pp. lii, 465.

To call, with Gooch, "Denifle's eight hundred pages hurled at the memory of the Reformer among the most repulsive books in historical literature," is not a bit too strong. That the author's feelings were so immensely enlisted would not matter if the man only had a spark of the candor and real desire to be fair that distinguishes the work of scholars like Pastor and Acton. But Denifle's mind was so warped by hatred that, while preternaturally sharp-sighted in detecting the slightest faults of Luther or the most trivial errors of modern Protestant scholars, he was, to the larger aspects of his subject, portentously blind. *Luther and Lutherdom* is a learned and elaborate libel.

Let us take a single example of its famous "method." The Dominican asserts that Luther set aside all prohibitions of consanguineous marriages, even that of parent and child and of brother and sister (p. 324). Any other scholar, in making so startling a charge, would

examine the evidence carefully. In proportion to the vast improbability that the Reformer should here have gone counter not only to all Christian sentiment but to that of the whole world, savage as well as civilized, the historian should have demanded copious proof and have sifted it judicially. One would expect that in a point like this a great stir would have been made and much would be forthcoming. But Denifle bases his assertion on a *single word*. When Spalatin drew up a table of forbidden degrees for the use of the Saxon Visitors, he wrote: "Bruder und Schwester mugen sich nicht verehelichen; so mag einer auch seines Bruders oder Schwester Tochter oder Enkel nicht nehmen." In revising the list Luther wrote opposite this section "Todt," which Denifle interprets to mean that he repealed the whole law (Enders: *Luthers Briefwechsel*, vi, 186). The intrinsic improbability of this interpretation is so enormous, unsupported as it is by a single other passage in all the Reformer's voluminous works, that, even if the document in question stood alone, the careful searcher for truth would be forced to conclude that, whatever "todt" meant, it could not mean this. But the document does not stand alone. With it Luther sent a letter (De Wette: *Luthers Briefe*, iii, 260), in which the real meaning of the word is clearly shown to be merely "strike out," and the reason is distinctly given, namely that it is better on such points to allow the Visitors to give oral instruction when necessary. In the same letter and paragraph Luther discusses the marriage of uncle and niece, which on Biblical precedent he allows, but he says not one word on the marriage of kinsmen in the first and second degrees, proof positive that he never even so much as contemplated the possibility of it.

Of course Denifle's work is not all as worthless as this. His wide reading in scholastic and patristic literature served to elucidate some of Luther's ideas and to point out the failings of his recent editors and biographers. But though the scholar can still learn something from this work, yet its value has greatly decreased since it was first published fourteen years ago. Luther's commentary on Romans, known to Denifle in manuscript, has since been published in model form, and the researches of Scheel and Ficker and A. V. Müller and Grisar and many other scholars have left the learned Dominican far in the rear.

The worst that can usually be said of the present translation is that it is extremely inelegant, and the proof poorly read ("Eues" for "Cues," p. xlvii, "Raumburg" for "Naumburg," p. 143). The inelegance is due in part to the desire to be literal, as when Volz

renders, "Aurifaber omitted this passage, likely as smutty" (p. 105). In some cases, however, the sense of the original is totally missed. Where Denifle wrote: "Man müsse meinem Werke gegenüber den Standpunkt Niedriger hängen, einnehmen: Luther und der Protestantismus werde durch dasselbe nicht berührt," Volz translates: "My work is to be offset by the viewpoint of Niedriger — assume that Luther and Protestantism are not touched by it" (p. viii). "Niedriger," of course, is not a proper name, but a common noun meaning "obscure people."

PRESERVED SMITH.

POUGHKEEPSIE, N.Y.

CORRESPONDENCE OF JOHN HENRY NEWMAN WITH JOHN KEBLE AND OTHERS. 1839-45. Edited at the Birmingham Oratory. Longmans, Green, & Co. 1917. Pp. x, 413. \$4.00.

Those, and they are many, for whom the name of Newman is still one to conjure with, will notice with surprise the meticulous caution with which the censorship of the Church has been brought to bear upon these Letters. The author was the greatest Catholic divine in a century of reaction. He did not suffer fools, even in high places, gladly; but his differences with the Rome of Pius IX were with its temper and methods, not with its teaching. Folly, carried beyond a certain point, became, he thought, a moral fault. Acton, who read him more accurately than any of his contemporaries, and from the wider European rather than from the provincial English standpoint, makes no question of his Ultramontanism; on which his elevation to the Cardinalate by Leo XIII, one of the most Roman, though one of the wisest, of Pontiffs, set the final seal. Yet the permission of three several Censors, one of them an Archbishop, is required before this selection from his letters between 1839 and 1845 can be published. And the censorship, it should be remembered, is negative, not positive; that is, it does not express approval. What it says is "Nihil Obstat"; there is no sufficient reason to refuse permission for the book to be printed. Such precaution does not inspire confidence. We do not know how far we have the real Newman; all that we can be sure of is that we have Newman as the ecclesiastical authorities wish him to appear. It is possible that in the letters of the years covered by the present collection there is little to which they could take exception. But there are periods in his life of which this could certainly not be said. His papers and correspondence, for example, between 1860 and 1876 would be of